

1998 KENTUCKY REPORT TO CONGRESS ON WATER QUALITY

**KENTUCKY NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION CABINET**

DIVISION OF WATER



***1998 KENTUCKY
REPORT TO CONGRESS
ON WATER QUALITY***

**KENTUCKY NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION CABINET**

DIVISION OF WATER

JANUARY 1999


The Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, or disability and provides, on request, reasonable accommodations including auxiliary aids and services necessary to afford an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to participate in all services, programs, and activities.

This report was printed with state funds on recycled paper.


1998 REPORT TO CONGRESS

**Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection
Kentucky Division of Water
Water Quality Branch
Frankfort, Kentucky**

This report has been approved for release:



**Jack A. Wilson, Director
Kentucky Division of Water**



Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
Introduction.....	1
Data Collection	1
Ambient Monitoring Programs.....	1
Reference Reach Program.....	6
Intensive Surveys.....	7
Other Data Sources	7
Assessment Methodology	11
Aquatic Life and Primary Contact Recreation Use Support.....	12
Fish Consumption Use Support.....	15
Drinking Water Use Support	15
Use Support Summary	17
Streams and Rivers	17
Lakes.....	21
Wetlands	22
Ground Water	24
Water Pollution Control Programs.....	24

Introduction

This report was prepared by the Kentucky Division of Water (DOW) following submittal of electronic data to U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in April 1998 to fulfill requirements of Section 305(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-500) as subsequently amended and commonly known as the Clean Water Act. Section 305(b) requires that states submit to EPA on a biennial basis a report assessing current water quality conditions. This report presents an assessment of Kentucky's water quality for the period October 1995 through September 1997. Information contained in the Background section (including the atlas) of the 1996 Kentucky Water Quality Report to Congress has not changed and can be accessed in that report.

Data Collection

The water quality assessment of rivers and streams in this report is based on the support of designated uses in state waters depicted on U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 1:100,000 scale topographic maps, excluding the Mississippi River. According to EPA's Reach File 3, the maps contain about 49,100 miles of streams. Approximately 9,232 miles were assessed by the DOW. The 664 miles of the Ohio River bordering Kentucky were assessed by the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission (ORSANCO).

Ambient Monitoring Programs

Water Quality. Forty-four primary ambient water quality monitoring stations, characterizing approximately 1,432 stream miles, were operated by the DOW during the reporting period. (Table 1; Figure 1). For ground water, over 100 ambient monitoring sites are maintained by DOW. In addition, 13 lakes were sampled for eutrophication trends. Water quality data from nine stations operated by federal and other state agencies were used to supplement DOW water quality data (Table 2; Figure 1). Various other water quality data sources are described in a later section.

Table 1. Kentucky Division of Water Fixed-Station Monitoring Network

MAP NO.	STATION NAME	RIVER MILE	ROAD LOCATION	BIOLOGICAL SAMPLING PERFORMED 1996 - 1997
1	Tug Fork at Kermit	35.1	KY 40	X
2	Levisa Fork near Louisa	29.6	KY 644	
3	Levisa Fork near Pikeville	114.6	KY 1426	X
4	Little Sandy River near Argillite	13.2	KY 1	
5	Tygart's Creek near Load	28.1	KY 7	
6	Kinniconick Creek near Tannery	10.4	KY 1149	
7	Licking River at Claysville	78.2	US 62	X
8	N. Fork Licking River at Milford	6.9	KY 19	X
9	S. Fork Licking River at Morgan	11.7	KY 1054	X
10	Licking River at West Liberty	226.4	US 60	X
11	Little KY River near Bedford	9.4	US 42	
12	Kentucky River at Frankfort	66.4	St. Clair St. Bridge	
13	Kentucky River at High Bridge	135.1		
50	Kentucky River at Lockport	31.0		
14	Eagle Creek at Glencoe	21.5	US 127	
15	S. Elkhorn Creek near Midway	25.3	Moore's Mill Rd. Bridge	
16	Dix River near Danville	34.6	KY 52	
17	Boone Creek at Hunt Club	3.8	Grimes Mill Rd.	
18	Red River at Clay City	21.6	KY 11/15	
19	Kentucky R. near Trapp	191.2	Red River Ferry Rd.	
20	N. Fk Kentucky R. at Jackson	304.5 ^c	Old KY 30	
21	M. Fk. Kentucky R. at Tallega	8.3	KY 708	
22	S. Fk Kentucky R. at Booneville	12.1	KY 28	
23	Salt River at Shepherdsville	22.9	KY 61	
24	Salt River at Glensboro	82.5	KY 53	
25	Rolling Fk near Lebanon Junction ^d	12.3	KY 434	
25A	Rolling Fk at New Haven	38.8	US 31E	X
26	Beech Fork near Maud	48.1	KY 55	X
27	Pond Creek near Louisville	15.5	Manslick Rd. Bridge	
28	Green River near Livermore		Livermore Boat Ramp	
29	Pond River near Sacramento	12.4	KY 85	
30	Rough River near Dundee	62.5	Barrets Ford Bridge	
31	Mud River near Gus	17.4	KY 949	
32	Barren River at Bowling Green ^d	37.5	College St. Bridge	
32A	Barren River at L & D I ^c	14.5	Greencastle Rd.	
33	Green River at Munfordville	225.9	US 31W	
34	Nolin River at White Mills	80.9	White Mills Ridge	

35	Bacon Creek near Priceville	7.2	C. Avery Rd. Bridge	
36	Tradewater River near Sullivan	15.1	US 60/641	
36A	Tradewater River near Olney	72.7	KY 1220	
37	Little River near Cadiz	24.4	KY 272	X
51	Clarks River ^e	56.7		X
52	West Fork Clarks River ^e	21.0		X
54	Red River - Dot ^e	58.8		X
55	Obion Creek - Mayfield ^f	48.2		X
38	Cumberland R. at Turkey Neck ^d	393.7	KY 214	
39	Big S. Fk. Cumberland R. at Blue Heron	44.7	Old Rail Bridge	X
56	Cumberland River @ Molus	679.1		X
40	Rock Creek near Bell Farm	17.1	White Oak Bridge	X
41	Little South Fk. Cumberland R. near Ritner Ford	5.4	Freedom Church	X
42	Rockcastle River at Billows	24.4	Old KY 80	X
43	Horse Lick Creek near Lamero	7.5	Daugherty Rd. Ford	
53	Poor Fork @ Rosspoint ^f	695.4		X
44	Cumberland R. at Cumberland Falls	562.3	KY 90	X
45	Cumberland R. at Pineville ^d	654.4	Pine St. Bridge	
46	Martins Fk near Cumberland Gap National Pk	27.4	Off Hwy 987	X
47	Clarks River at Almo	53.5	Almo-Shiloh Rd. Bridge	
48	Mayfield Creek near Magee Springs	10.8	KY 121	X
49	Bayou de Chien near Clinton	15.1	US 51	X

^a Water quality samples collected monthly


^b Stations not sampled in 1996-1997

^c 49.7 miles upstream of confluence with S. Fk KY R.

^d Water quality site only

^e Biological site only

Figure 1.
Fixed Station Monitoring Network
Stream Station Locations
1998 305b



Biological. Kentucky's biological monitoring program consisted of a network of 49 stations located in 12 river basins (Table 1; Figure 1). The majority of the sites are at or near the physicochemical sampling sites. In 1993, the network was expanded to include stations on eight of the nine Kentucky Wild Rivers. Approximately one-fourth of the sites are sampled each year on a river basin approach. For instance, all stations in the Big Sandy, Licking, and Salt river basins were sampled in 1996, and all stations in the lower Cumberland, Tennessee and Mississippi river basins were sampled in 1997. Data collected from these 17 stations were used to assess warmwater aquatic habitat (WAH) use support in stream miles. The data were also used to determine potential sources of any use impairment, changes to existing water or habitat quality, background values against which future conditions can be compared, and problems with toxic and conventional pollutants, bacteriological contamination, and nuisance biological growth.

Table 2. Water Quality Stations Maintained by Federal and Other State Agencies		
<u>Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission</u>		
	River Mile No.	Map
Cumberland River at Pinckneyville	16.0	01
Tennessee River at Paducah	5.0	02
Green River near Sebree	41.3	03
Licking River at Covington	4.5	04
Big Sandy River near Louisa	20.5	05
<u>Virginia Department of Environmental Quality</u>		
Russell Fork near Elkhorn City	116.0	V1
Levisa Fork at state line	151.5	V2
Knox Creek at state line	7.6	V3
<u>West Virginia Department of Natural Resources</u>		
Tug Fork at Fort Gay, WV	0.1	W1

Algal samples were collected from each biological monitoring station using both artificial substrates (for biomass estimates) and natural substrates (for algal identification and community structure evaluation). The condition of the algal community was determined by a Diatom Bioassessment Index (DBI), which includes the following metrics: total number of

diatom species, diversity, pollution tolerance index, and relative abundance of sensitive species. Relative abundance of non-diatom algae and biomass (chlorophyll *a* and ash free dry-weight) were used to arrive at the DBI.

Fish were collected for community structure evaluation at biological monitoring sites where sampling could be conducted. The condition of the fish community was determined by species richness, relative abundance, species composition, and the Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI). The IBI was used to assess biotic integrity directly by evaluation of 12 attributes, or metrics, of fish communities in streams. These community metrics include measurement of species richness and composition, trophic structure, and fish abundance and condition. The IBI was used to assign one of the following categories to a fish community: excellent, good, fair, poor, very poor, or no fish.

Macroinvertebrates are collected from both artificial substrates and all available natural habitats. A Macroinvertebrate Bioassessment Index (MBI) is calculated from several other indices, including, at a minimum: 1) taxa richness, 2) total number of individuals, 3) Hilsenhoff Biotic Index, and 4) Percent Community Similarity Index. Additional metrics are used depending on factors such as ecoregion and type of impact.

Reference Reach Program

The DOW began a program in 1991 to gather physical, chemical, and biological data from the state's least impacted streams. The program looks at candidate waters as representative of geographic regions of the state known as ecoregions. This program defines the physical, chemical, and biological potentials for the streams of a particular ecoregion and allows a comparison with other streams in the same ecoregion. It also helps determine the potential legitimate uses of other streams in the same region. The data from this program will provide the basis for the development of narrative and numerical biocriteria for the various ecoregions of the Commonwealth. Data on chemical water quality, sediment quality, fish tissue residue, habitat condition, and biotic conditions are collected.

Fifty-five stream sites from seven proposed ecoregions were initially sampled in the spring and fall of 1992-1993 under the Reference Reach Program. For this reporting period, 11

new sites were also sampled, resulting in a total of 689 miles that have been assessed for WAH use since 1992. Forty of these sites have been placed into the Reference Reach Program (Table 3: Figure 2). Spring and fall collections will continue in order to increase the biological data base from undisturbed streams that can be used to compare with impacted streams. At the same time, program personnel will continue to develop and refine the necessary metrics used to evaluate the relationships between biotic communities and habitat conditions in streams across Kentucky.

Intensive Surveys

Twenty-nine intensive surveys were conducted on 178.1 miles of streams to evaluate point source and nonpoint agricultural pollution, baseline water quality, and the status of water quality in streams assessed previously.

Other Data Sources

Discharge Monitoring Data Reports. Discharge monitoring report data, collected by KPDES permit holders, were accessed through DOW's permit compliance system database. Depending on the relative sizes of the wastewater discharge and the receiving stream and the severity of permit violations, it was often possible to assess instream uses as threatened or impaired.

Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources Data. Fisheries investigation reports prepared by the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources (KDFWR) were used to assess WAH use for several streams. The KDFWR conducts field surveys that identify streams capable of supporting a sustainable year-round trout fishery. These data allow the DOW to classify streams as Coldwater Aquatic Habitat (CAH). Streams classified as CAH were considered to fully support the CAH use and were considered as monitored waters in the assessment.

Another source of data for the evaluated category was a list of streams recommended by the KDFWR as candidates for Outstanding Resource Waters. They were recommended because of

Table 3. KENTUCKY DIVISION OF WATER REFERENCE REACH SITES				
Map No.	Station Name	River Mile	County	Road Location
CENTRAL APPALACHIAN ECOREGION				
Kentucky River Basin				
1	Clemons Fork	0.5	Breathitt	Robinson Forest Rd.
2	Clemons Fork	0.6	Breathitt	Robinson Forest Rd.
3	Coles Fork	0.6	Breathitt	Robinson Forest Rd.
4	Right Fork Buffalo Creek	1.1	Owsley	Off Whoopflarea Rd.
Upper Cumberland River Basin				
5	Bad Branch	0.2	Letcher	KY 932 Bridge
6	Bark Camp Creek	2.5	Whitley	USFS Rd. 193
7	Cane Creek	7.0	Laurel	Off Middle Fork Rd.
8	Eagle Creek	3.0	McCreary	KY 896 Bridge
9	Marsh Creek	12.6	McCreary	KY 478 Bridge
10	South Fork Dog Slaughter Cr.	3.6	Whitley	USFS Rd. 195
WESTERN ALLEGHENY ECOREGION				
Licking River Basin				
11	Bucket Branch	0.1	Morgan	Leisure-Paragon Rd. Br.
12	Devils Fork	0.2	Morgan	KY 711 Bridge
13	North Fork	13.0	Morgan	Off Leisure-Paragon Rd.
Little Sandy River Basin				
14	Arabs Fork	0.1	Elliott	KY 1620 Bridge
15	Big Cane Creek	7.9	Elliott	Off Binion Ford Rd.
16	Laurel Creek	7.6	Elliott	Carter School Rd. Br.
Kentucky River Basin				
17	Station Camp Creek	19.0	Estill	Off KY 1209
18	South Fork Station Camp Creek	5.3	Jackson	KY 89 Bridge
19	Sturgeon Creek	4.0	Lee	Off Sturgeon Creek Rd.
Upper Cumberland River Basin				
20	Horse Lick Creek	1.9	Jackson	Horse Lick Creek Rd.
INTERIOR PLATEAU ECOREGION				
Green River Basin				
21	Beaverdam Creek	7.6	Edmonson	KY 101-259 Bridge
22	Gaspar River	32.4	Logan	Bucksville Rd. Bridge
23	Goose Creek	5.6	Casey	Off Brock Rd.
24	Russell Creek	60.5	Adair	KY Hwy. 80
25	Russell Creek	25.6	Adair	Off KY 768
26	Trammel Fork	18.5	Allen	Red Hill Rd. Bridge
27	Trammel Fork	26.6	Allen	Concord Church Rd. Br.


Lower Cumberland River Basin				
28	Whippoorwill Creek	4.3	Logan	KY 2395 Bridge
Kentucky River Basin				
29	Clear Creek	4.1	Woodford	Hifner Mill Rd. Bridge
30	Muddy Creek	13.4	Madison	KY 52 Bridge
Ohio River Basin				
31	Yellowbank Creek	4.4	Breckinridge	Cart-Manning Rd.
Salt River Basin				
32	Salt Lick Creek	5.3	Marion	Off Salt Lick Rd.
33	Wilson Creek	12.2	Bullitt	Mt. Carmel Church Rd.
Tradewater Basin				
34	Sandlick Creek	6.7	Christian	Mt. Carmel-Camp Cr. Rd.
35	Upper Tradwater River	128.9	Christian	T. Sparkman Rd. Bridge
Upper Cumberland River Basin				
36	Buck Creek	28.9	Pulaski	Off Bud Rainey Rd.
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY LOESS PLAINS ECOREGION				
Tennessee River Basin				
37	Blood River	15.1	Calloway	Grubbs Lane Rd. Bridge
38	Panther Creek	1.0	Calloway	KY 280 Bridge
39	Panther Creek	1.2	Graves	KY 2580 Bridge
40	Soldiers Creek	2.6	Marshall	KY 58 Bridge

their outstanding value as sport fishing streams. These streams were assessed as fully supporting warmwater aquatic habitat use if there were no data which conflicted with the assessment.

Louisville MSD/U.S. Geological Survey. The Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District, in cooperation with the USGS, has a monitoring program for streams in Jefferson County. Twenty-six stations are monitored for a variety of parameters including fecal coliform bacteria. Macroinvertebrate and fish collections are also made. The chemical and bacteriological data from 1992 - 1997 were used for this report, and they were considered to be monitored data in the assessments.

Figure 2.

REFERENCE REACH SITES



Kentucky State Nature Preserves Commission. Data from streams surveyed by the KSNPC for a special project to obtain background aquatic biota and water quality data in the oil shale region of the state was published in a 1984 report entitled Aquatic Biota and Water Quality and Quantity Survey of the Kentucky Oil Shale Region. Although more than ten years old, these data are still considered valid and were used in this report.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Field work conducted for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and verified by the KSNPC and KDFWR, identified streams in Kentucky that harbored the blackside dace, a federally threatened species of fish. This work was considered as monitored data. These streams are automatically classified as Outstanding Resource Waters and were judged to fully support the WAH use.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Blaine Creek watershed has been monitored by the COE-Huntington District for several years in conjunction with the Yatesville Lake project. The COE macroinvertebrate and chemical data were utilized for this report.

U.S. Forest Service. U.S. Forest Service data were used for several streams in the Daniel Boone National Forest.

Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government. The local government conducts biological and water quality monitoring of several streams in Fayette County. These data were used in assessing WAH and swimming uses for this reporting period.

Assessment Methodology

Overall use support was assessed by following EPA guidelines that define fully supporting as fully supporting all uses for which data are available. If a segment supported one use but did not support another, it was listed as not supporting. For instance, if a segment supported a warmwater aquatic habitat use but not a primary contact recreation use, it was listed as not

supporting. A segment is listed as partially supporting if any assessed use fell into that category even if another use was fully supported. Many waterbodies were assessed for only one use because data were not available to assess other uses.

Aquatic Life and Primary Contact Recreation Use Support

The water quality and biological data described in the preceding pages were used to determine stream use support status. The data were categorized as “monitored” or “evaluated.” Monitored data were derived from site-specific ambient surveys and were generally no more than five years old. In some instances where watershed conditions remained mostly unchanged, monitored data collected prior to 1993 were still considered valid, and streams described by those data were categorized as monitored. Evaluated data were from other sources such as questionnaires to regional field personnel or from ambient surveys that were conducted more than five years ago. The criteria for assessing these data to determine use support are explained below.

In areas where both chemical and biological data were available, the biological data were generally the determinant factor for establishing WAH use support status. This was especially true when copper, lead, or zinc criteria were contradicted by biological criteria. The DOW made this decision in recognition of the natural ability of surface waters to sequester metals, rendering them less available to aquatic life by reducing the toxic “dissolved” fraction.

Water Quality Data. Chemical data collected by the DOW, ORSANCO, Virginia, West Virginia, and the USGS at fixed stations were evaluated according to EPA guidelines for the preparation of this report. Water quality data were entered into EPA’s national storage and retrieval (STORET) database and compared to criteria. The segment fully supported the WAH use when criteria for dissolved oxygen, un-ionized ammonia, temperature, and pH were not met in 10 percent or less of the samples collected from October 1995 through September 1997. Partial support was indicated if any one criterion for these parameters was not met 11-25 percent of the time. The segment was not supporting if any one of these criteria was not met more than 25 percent of the time.

Data for mercury, cadmium, copper, lead, and zinc were analyzed for violations of acute criteria listed in state water quality standards using three years of data (from October 1994 through September 1997). The segment fully supported its use if all criteria were met at stations with quarterly or less frequent sampling or if only one violation occurred at stations with monthly sampling. Partial support was indicated if any one criterion was not met more than once but in less than 10 percent of the samples. The segment was not supporting if criteria were exceeded in greater than 10 percent of the samples. The assessment criteria are closely linked to the way state water quality criteria were developed. Aquatic life are considered to be protected if, on the average, the acute criteria are not exceeded more than once every three years. Fecal coliform and pH data were used to indicate the degree of support for Primary Contact Recreation (swimming) use. The swimming use was fully supported if the criterion was not met in 10 percent or less of the measurements, partially supported if the criterion was not met in 11-25 percent of the measurements, and not supported if the criterion was not met more than 25 percent of the time. Streams with pH below 6.0 units were judged to not support swimming use.

Biological Data. Biological data for 1996-1997 were collected from 17 fixed monitoring network stations in six river basins, 40 reference reach sites, and 29 intensive surveys. Algae, macroinvertebrates, and fish were collected, and several community structure function metrics were analyzed for each group of organisms as described earlier in this chapter. These metrics were used to determine biotic integrity and designated use support for each stream segment monitored (Table 4). Expectations for metric values are dependent upon stream size, ecoregion, and habitat quality and were applied accordingly. Bioassessments integrated data from each group of organisms, habitat data, selected physical and chemical parameters, and professional judgment of aquatic biologists.

The diatom bioassessment index classifies algal communities as excellent or good (supporting), fair (partially supporting), or poor (not supporting). For the macroinvertebrate evaluations, stream reaches were considered to fully support the WAH use if information reflected no alterations in community structure or functional compositions for the available

Table 4. Biological Criteria for Assessment of Warmwater Aquatic Habitat (WAH) Use Support			
	Fully Supporting	Paritally Supporting	Not Supporting
Algae	Diatom Bioassessment Index (DBI) Classification of excellent or good, biomass similar to reference/control or STORET mean.	DBI classification of fair, increased biomass (if nutrient enriched) of filamentous green algae.	DBI classification of poor, biomass very low (toxicity), or high (organic enrichment).
Macroinvertebrate	Macroinvertebrate Bioassessment Index (MBI) excellent or good, high EPT, sensitive species present.	MBI classification of fair, EPT lower than expected in relation to available habitat, reduction in RA of sensitive taxa. Some alterations of functional groups evident.	MBI classification of poor, EPT low, TNI of tolerant taxa very high. Most functional groups missing from community.
Fish	Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) excellent or good, presence of rare, endangered or species of special concern.	IBI fair.	IBI poor, very poor, or no fish.

EPT=Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, Trichoptera, RA=Relative Abundance, TNI=Total Number of Individuals

habitats and if habitat conditions were relatively undisturbed. A reach was considered partially supporting uses when information revealed that community structure was slightly altered, that functional feeding components were noticeably influenced, or if available habitats reflected some alterations and/or reductions. Reaches were considered not supporting uses if information reflected sustained alterations or deletions in community structure, taxa richness and functional feeding types, or if available habitats were severely reduced or eliminated. For fish, reaches with an IBI of excellent or good were considered to fully support uses. Reaches were assessed as partially supporting uses if they had an IBI of fair, while reaches were considered not supporting uses when the IBI category was poor, very poor, or no fish.

Fish Consumption Use Support

Fish consumption is a category that, in conjunction with aquatic life use, assesses attainment of the fishable goal of the Clean Water Act. Assessment of the fishable goal was separated into these two categories in 1992 because a fish consumption advisory does not preclude attainment of the aquatic life use and vice versa. Separating fish consumption and aquatic life uses gives a clearer picture of actual water quality conditions.

The following criteria were used to assess support for the fish consumption use:

- Fully Supporting: No fish advisories or bans in effect.
- Partially Supporting: “Restricted consumption” fish advisory or ban in effect for general population or a subpopulation that could be at potentially greater risk (e.g., pregnant women, children). Restricted consumption is defined as limits on the number of meals consumed per unit time for one or more fish species.
- Not Supporting: “No consumption” fish advisory or ban in effect for general population, or a subpopulation that could be at potentially greater risk, for one or more fish species; commercial fishing ban in effect.

Drinking Water Use Support

In 1986, amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) required the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set drinking water standards for 83 contaminants listed in the Act and an additional 25 contaminants every three years thereafter. EPA established a phased approach for introducing standards and requirements for testing for the first group of 83 contaminants.

Phase I - established maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for a group of 8 volatile organic compounds.

Phase II - established MCLs for 17 pesticides, 8 inorganics, 10 volatile organics, a new MCL for PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls), and deleted the MCL for silver.

Phase III - set criteria for radionuclides.

Phase IV - set criteria for disinfection by-products and for disinfection for groundwater.

Phase V - set drinking water standards for 5 inorganics, 3 volatile organics, 9 pesticides, and 6 other organic contaminants.

Phase II of EPA's schedule required monitoring and reporting for a large number of contaminants to be completed by 1995. Phase V established MCLs and maximum contaminant level goals (MCLGs) for a number of Phase II contaminants. (MCLs are enforceable standards considered feasible and safe. MCLGs are nonenforceable health goals that water systems should try to achieve.) Phase V also took advantage of the monitoring information provided through Phase II. These two phases required testing for the largest number of contaminants of the five phases.

Original cost estimates for each water system to do Phase II/Phase V analyses ranged from \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year. Because of costs and the small number of laboratories certified to do the required tests (in 1993, there were no labs fully certified for these tests in Kentucky), the Department for Environmental Protection committed its analytical laboratory, the Division of Environmental Services to carry out testing for systems that served 10,000 or fewer customers. Larger public and industrial/commercial systems were responsible for their own sampling and analysis.

The department conducted sample analyses and provided sampling containers, preservatives, supplies, and transportation costs involved in getting the samples to the lab. During 1993, DOW personnel spent 3,844 hours in various aspects of the sampling program. The project consumed almost all of the laboratory's capacity for analyzing organics. Organic analyses of other samples collected by the department were contracted to commercial laboratories.

Sampling for each system was done on a quarterly basis, and results from four consecutive quarters were used to determine compliance. Following the initial four quarters of sampling, a three-year monitoring period was established. Waivers may be granted for individual systems for various contaminants based upon initial sampling results and vulnerability of the system to those contaminants.

For purposes of assessing drinking water use, results of the Phase II/Phase V and subsequent compliance monitoring of finished water were compared to MCLs. Although not a quantitative

measurement of ambient water quality, it highlights waters in which certain pollutants are high enough to exceed drinking water criteria even after conventional treatment by the drinking water plant. Lacking instream data, which historically has been scarce in Kentucky for drinking water constituents, EPA's 1998 305(b) report guidance recommends using the finished water data for assessing drinking water use support.

Use Support Summary

Streams and Rivers

Aquatic life, swimming, drinking water, and fish consumption uses were assessed. Excluding the Ohio River, full support of uses occurred in 6,153 miles (67 percent), uses were not supported in 2,004 miles (21 percent), and partial use impairment was found in 1,072 miles (12 percent) of the assessed waters (Table 5.) This summary does not include ORSANCO's assessment of the mainstem of the Ohio River. ORSANCO reported that none of the 664 miles of the Ohio River bordering Kentucky fully supported swimming or fish consumption uses. For aquatic life use, 553 miles fully supported and 61 miles partially supported. Swimming use was affected mostly by combined sewer overflows. Fish consumption use was affected by limited fish consumption advisories for PCBs and chlordane in fish tissue. The Mississippi River, which forms 71 miles of Kentucky's western border, was assessed by Missouri.

Swimming use was impaired to a much greater extent than was aquatic life use (Table 6). The major causes of use nonsupport were fecal coliform bacteria contamination (pathogen indicators), which affected swimming use, and siltation and nutrients, which impaired aquatic life use (Table 7). Nonpoint sources impacted about three times as many miles as point sources. The major sources of the fecal coliform contamination were sanitary (both municipal and package wastewater treatment plants), agricultural nonpoint sources, septic tanks, and straight pipes. Sanitary wastewater facilities were also the source of the organic enrichment, while mining and agricultural nonpoint sources were the major sources of siltation (Table 8).

For the drinking water use, 68 of the 389 public water suppliers dependent on surface waters had 171 violations of maximum contaminant levels (MCL) for the period October 1, 1995 to

September 30, 1997. Violations were for total coliform, turbidity, and trihalomethanes. These problems were a result of treatment processes and do not relate to instream use impairment. Eighteen groundwater systems had 27 MCL violations for inorganics (cadmium, barium, thallium, beryllium), nitrates, and total coliform.

Inadequate sewer collection systems are a major concern in many towns. Surface waters are impacted by overflows from these systems primarily during and immediately following rainfall events.

Swimming advisories were in effect in three areas of the state, and citizens have been advised not to swim in streams in and downstream of urban areas following rainfall events. Fecal coliform contamination caused swimming advisories to be re-issued for the Licking River and two tributary streams near Covington, 86 miles of the upper reaches of the North Fork Kentucky River, and the Cumberland River and several streams in the Upper Cumberland River basin in Bell and Harlan counties.

Fish consumption advisories remain in effect for the Mud River and Town Branch in Logan, Butler, and Muhlenberg counties, the West Fork of Drakes Creek in Simpson and Warren counties, Green River Lake, and Little Bayou Creek in McCracken County because of PCB contamination, and for five ponds on the West Kentucky Wildlife Management Area (McCracken County) because of mercury from unknown sources. The entire length (664 miles) of the Ohio River bordering Kentucky remains posted with fish consumption advisories because of PCB and chlordane contamination. The Ohio River advisories are specifically for the consumption of channel catfish, carp, white bass, paddlefish, and paddlefish eggs. Twenty-seven fish kills totaling about 32,304 fish were reported by the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources during 1996-1997, affecting 67 miles. Fish kills were most commonly attributed to nutrients and oxygen-demanding materials.

For a report of all the streams assessed, see the Division of Water's website at <http://water.nr.state.ky.us/305b/data.pdf>. For a map of assessed streams, see <http://water.nr.state.ky.us/305b/maps.htm>.

Table 5. Summary of Assessed Use Support^a Miles			
	Assessed Basis		
Degree of Support	Evaluated	Monitored	Total
Fully Supporting	1773.6	4154.8	5928.4
Fully Supporting but Threatened	91.7	133.1	224.8
Partially Supporting	423.7	648.7	1072.4
Miles Not Supporting	580.6	1423.1	2003.7
TOTAL	2869.6	6362.5	9232.1

^a Excludes mainstems of Ohio and Mississippi rivers; refer to ORSANCO and Missouri 305(b) reports

Table 6. Summary of Individual Use Support Rivers and Streams					
Use	Full Support	Threatened	Partial Support	Non Support	Total
1. AQUATIC LIFE					
Miles	5960.2	263.70	998.20	1052.40	8,275.50
Percent	72.0	3.2	12.1	12.7	100.0
2. SWIMMABLE					
Miles	538.10	77.40	503.60	1391.20	2,510.30
Percent	21.4	3.1	20.1	55.4	100.0
3. FISH CONSUMPTION					
Miles	1532.10		4.40	122.70	1,659.20
Percent	92.3		0.3	7.4	100.0
4. DRINKING WATER					
SUPPLY					
Miles	1425.30	18.00			1,443.30
Percent	98.8	1.2			100.0

Table 7. Causes of Use Impairment Rivers and Streams		
Cause	Miles Affected	Percent
Pathogens	1617.0	31.0
Siltation	1136.3	21.8
Nutrients	576.5	11.1
Organic Enrichment/Low DO	474.6	9.1
Habitat Alterations (non-flow)	337.8	6.5
pH	286.2	5.5
Suspended Solids	189.5	3.6
Metals	163.3	3.1
PCBs	132.1	2.5
Salinity/TDS/Chlorides	78.0	1.5
Oil and Grease	42.5	0.8
Cause Unknown	29.2	0.6
Flow Alterations	26.1	0.5
Pesticides	22.9	0.4
Priority Organics	18.0	0.3
Ammonia (unionized)	17.4	0.3
Noxious Aq.Plants native	13.4	0.3
Radiation	13.0	0.2
Unknown Toxicity	11.2	0.2
Chlorine	8.7	0.2
Nonpriority Organics	8.4	0.2
Mercury	6.5	0.1
Thermal Modifications	6.5	0.1
Turbidity	1.4	0.0
TOTAL	5216.5	100.

Table 8. Sources of Use Impairment - Rivers and Streams						
	Point		Nonpoint		Total	
Source	Miles	Percent	Miles	Percent	Miles	Percent
Agriculture			984.3	28.1	984.30	19.7
Resource Extraction			916.8	26.2	916.80	18.3
Municipal Point Sources	810.7	65.3			810.70	16.2
Improper Waste Disposal (includes straight pipes)			590.0	16.8	590.0	11.8
Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers			450.6	12.9	450.60	9.0
Industrial Point Sources	276.8	22.3			276.80	5.5
Source Unknown					260.10	5.2
Hydromodification			128.2	3.7	128.20	2.6
Habitat Modification			115.3	3.3	115.30	2.3
Collection System Failure	113.20	9.1			113.20	2.3
Grazing-Related Sources			82.3	2.3	82.30	1.6
Construction			67.6	1.9	67.60	1.4
Crop-Related Sources			63.8	1.8	63.80	1.3
Silviculture			56.1	1.6	56.10	1.1
Animal Feeding Operations			41.6	1.2	41.60	0.8
Combined Sewer Overflow	40.4	3.3			40.40	0.8
Spills			6.0	0.2	6.00	0.1
Natural Sources			1.7	0.0	1.70	0.0

Lakes

The water quality assessment of lakes included more than 90 percent of the publicly owned lake acreage of Kentucky. Eighty-eight of 121 lakes (73 percent) fully supported their uses, 27 (23 percent) partially supported uses, and 6 (5 percent) did not support one or more uses. On an acreage basis, more than 92 percent (199,961 acres) of the 218,362 assessed acres fully supported uses, eight percent (17,849 acres) partially supported uses, and less than one percent (552 acres) did not support one or more uses (Table 9).

Nutrients were the most frequent cause of uses in lakes not being fully supported (Table 10). Agricultural runoff, land disposal, and septic tanks were the principal sources of the nutrients (Table 11). PCBs affected one lake of considerable size, resulting in a high percentage of lake

acres impacted by priority organics (Table 10). Naturally shallow lake basins, which allow the proliferation of nuisance aquatic weeds that impair secondary contact recreation, accounted for the second greatest cause of use nonsupport. Other natural conditions such as manganese releases from anoxic hypolimnetic water and nutrients in runoff from relatively undisturbed watersheds affected domestic water supply and secondary contact uses, respectively. Suspended solids from surface mining activities impaired the secondary contact recreation use in fewer eastern Kentucky reservoirs than in the previous two-year reporting period.

An analysis of lake trophic status indicated that of the 105 lakes assessed, 58 (55.2 percent) were eutrophic (including three that were hypereutrophic), 35 (33.3 percent) were mesotrophic, and 12 (11.4 percent) were oligotrophic. One-half of the lake acres assessed (108,151 acres) were eutrophic. Of the rest, 22 percent were mesotrophic and 29 percent were oligotrophic.

Wetlands

Wetlands are considered waters of the Commonwealth and are protected from loss and degradation primarily through the process of Water Quality Certification. The WQC process requires that new wetland impacts be mitigated at a minimum ratio of two acres restored for each one acre lost. With the exception of wetland losses due to surface coal mining in Western Kentucky, most wetland losses are small and due to development impacts in growing urban areas. In the time period 1996-1997, the historical trend toward unmitigated wetland loss was reversed.

In addition to wetland mitigation required for permitted wetland losses, a wetland mitigation “bank” was established in Nelson County. This facility is a private for-profit venture that has restored 91 acres of prior converted wetland back to wetland status in hopes of selling wetland “credits” to those in need of wetland mitigation in the future. Two more “banks” are under review at the present time. One advantage of this approach is that wetland acres are restored before losses occur. This allows the time necessary to restore the wetland functions that are lost. Wetland banking is gaining favor nationwide and is on the rise in Kentucky.

Table 9. Summary of Lake Use Support		
Degree of Support	Number	Acres
Fully Supporting	88	199,961
Partially Supporting	27	17,849
Miles Not Supporting	6	552

Table 10. Causes of Use Impairment Lakes		
Name	Acres Affected	Percent
Priority Organics	8210	43
Nutrients	7513	40
Suspended Solids	1940	10
Metals	452	2
Shallow Lake Basin	551	3
Other inorganics	135	1
pH	219	1

Table 11. Sources of Impairment		
Name	Acres Affected	Percent
Industrial Point Sources	8210	31
Source Unknown	6743	26
Agriculture	5582	21
Resource Extraction	2294	9
Land Disposal	1475	6
Natural Sources	1418	5
Other (Septic Tanks)	153	1
Municipal Point Sources	139	1
Contaminated Sediments	86	>1


Ground Water

The DOW continues to operate an ambient ground water monitoring network of more than 100 sites. Data analyses of nitrate and pesticides from wells in western Kentucky have been published, and work is in progress to publish more data analyses in cooperation with the Kentucky Geological Survey. The Ground Water Branch has identified the major sources of ground water contamination as animal feedlots, fertilizer and pesticide applications, underground storage tanks, landfills, surface impoundments, septic systems, mining activities, spills, and urban runoff.

Water Pollution Control Programs

In order to better characterize the water of the state and better coordinate resources toward addressing problems, Kentucky is adopting a Watershed Management Framework. The purpose of this management framework is to use programs, people, information, and funds as efficiently as possible to protect, maintain, and restore water and land resources. This approach provides a framework, in time and place, within which participating individuals and institutions can link and support one another's efforts in watershed management.

According to the adopted Framework, the state is divided into five basin management units (see Schedule below) for the purposes of focusing management activities spatially. Activities within each unit will follow a five-year schedule, staggered by one year, so that efforts can be better focused temporally within a basin. Phases in the cycle include collecting information about water resources in the basin, identifying priority watersheds, listing the watersheds in the basin in order of priority and deciding which problems can be solved with existing funds, determining how best to solve the problems in the watershed, developing an Action Plan, and carrying out the strategies in the plan. Public participation is also encouraged throughout the process, allowing citizens and organizations to stay informed and have an active role in management of the resource.



Each basin will be phased into the Watershed Framework schedule as listed below:

- July 1997 – Kentucky River Basin
- July 1998 – Salt and Licking River Basins
- July 1999 – Cumberland, Tennessee, and Mississippi River Basins
- July 2000 – Green and Tradewater River Basins
- July 2001 – Big Sandy, Little Sandy, and Tygarts River Basins

Benefits of this approach include:

- Better coordination of resource management activities around common basin management units and schedules:
- Partnering can stretch limited dollars for implementation activities
- Better information about water resources without higher monitoring costs:
- More data as monitoring efforts are coordinated – a four-fold increase in assessment data is expected in the Kentucky River Basin in 1998
- Better data as agencies standardize methods and procedures.
- Greater opportunities for citizen involvement

The ground water program in Kentucky continues to make advances to strengthen protection strategies and to implement regulations. The Driller Certification Program and Wellhead Protection Program continue to ensure that water obtained from wells drilled in the state is safe

for all citizens. The Wellhead Protection Program was part of Kentucky's Source Water Assessment Program (SWAP) submitted to EPA in 1997. The Kentucky SWAP was the first in the nation to be submitted to EPA for approval. Programs and regulations of agencies other than the Division of Water (e.g. State Superfund and RCRA programs) are also being fully implemented (Table 12).

Water Watch, a citizens' education program, has 270 water testing teams in place, each equipped with field kits that measure dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature, nitrates, chloride, and iron. Also, 160 biological monitoring teams have been placed in the field. The Water Watch Program also supports shoreline cleanup projects, community education, and leadership training. A total of \$100,000, in the form of seed grants of up to \$5,000, was again provided through the Community Rivers and Streams Programs to help watershed organizations improve river and riparian management. The DOW supports these organizations with technical support and information. Also, the DOW has created an international "Sister Rivers" project to link river groups from different countries with Kentucky-based watershed organizations.

Kentucky's water pollution control programs continued to improve existing water quality and develop new approaches for controlling pollution. Permitting of combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and stormwater outfalls was initiated in the summer and fall of 1991 and proceeded throughout this 305(b) reporting period. By the end of 1997, 86 municipal and 59 industrial wastewater treatment facilities had KPDES permit requirements for whole effluent toxicity testing. The DOW conducted acute and chronic toxicity tests on 45 point source discharges in 1996 and 1997. A total of 1,589 tests were conducted by permitted facilities. One hundred and nineteen facilities (82 percent) were in compliance with their toxicity limits, and 26 facilities (18 percent) were conducting toxicity identification/reduction evaluations to reduce the toxicity of their effluents.

Pretreatment programs have been approved in 76 cities to better treat industrial wastes flowing into publicly owned treatment works. Sixty-eight of the programs are active. New programs were approved and implemented in five municipalities.

A state revolving loan fund program has continued to help meet the needs of wastewater treatment plant construction. Twenty-six municipal wastewater treatment projects were

Table 12. Ground Water Protection Programs		
Programs or Activities	Implementation Status	Responsible State Agency
Active SARA Title III Program	Continuing efforts	Department for Environmental Protection Commissioner's Office
Ambient ground water monitoring system	Continuing efforts	Division of Water
Aquifer vulnerability assessment	Completed	Division of Water
Aquifer mapping	Ongoing	Kentucky Geological Survey
Aquifer characterization	Ongoing	Kentucky Geological Survey
Comprehensive data management system	Fully Established	Division of Water
CSGWPP	Evaluating	Division of Water
Ground water discharge permits	Continuing efforts	Division of Water
Ground water Best Management Practices	Fully established	Division of Conservation
Ground water legislation	Fully implemented	Division of Water
Ground water classification		
Ground water quality standards		
Interagency coordination for ground water protection initiatives	Fully established	Interagency Technical Advisory Committee
Nonpoint source controls	Fully established	KPDES
Pesticide State Management Plan	Fully established	Division of Pesticides
Pollution Prevention Program	Continuing implementation	Division of Water
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Primacy	Continuing efforts	Division of Waste Management
State RCRA Program incorporating more stringent requirements than RCRA Primacy		
State septic system regulations	Fully established	Health Services Cabinet
Underground Storage Tank Installation Requirements	Fully established	Division of Waste Management
Underground Storage Tank Remediation	Fully established	PSTEAF
Underground Storage Tank Permit Programs	Continuing efforts	Division of Waste Management
Underground Injection Control Program	Fully established	EPA Region IV
Vulnerability assessment for drinking water wellhead protection	Completed	Division of Water
Well Abandonment Regulations	Continuing efforts	Division of Water
Wellhead Protection Program (EPA-approved)	Fully established	Division of Water
Well installation regulations	Continuing efforts	Division of Water

completed in 1995-97. These projects have either replaced outdated or inadequate treatment facilities, addressed inflow/infiltration problems, or have provided a centralized collection and treatment system for the first time. Since 1989, Kentucky has received more than \$202 million in capitalization grants and has added \$40 million in state funds under this program.

The Kentucky Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution Control Program is currently providing oversight and funding (Clean Water Act Section 319[h] grants) for 70 active projects. These projects seek to reduce and control runoff pollution through watershed demonstrations, education, training, best management practice demonstration, technical assistance and enforcement. Kentucky's NPS program has received a total of more than \$11 million through Section 319(h) grants from EPA since 1990.

NPS biologists continue to monitor water quality in two watersheds with NPS pollution remediation demonstration projects. The Upper Salt River/Taylorsville Lake and Fleming Creek projects both involve agricultural pollution remediation throughout the entire watershed. These are long-term studies to determine nonpoint source impacts and demonstrate water quality improvements from best management practices. Other important watershed remediation projects being implemented by NPS Program cooperator include Mammoth Cave (agriculture), Triplett Creek (on-site wastewater), Horse Lick Creek (off road vehicles), and Panther Creek (agriculture). Grant funds are also provided to support other monitoring initiatives including an expansion of DOW's surface and groundwater monitoring and stream-flow partitioning analysis of the surface water data.

Education efforts in the NPS program are producing several noteworthy achievements. Two video programs on pollution problems from nonpoint sources in Kentucky were produced under contract with Western Kentucky University. One of the videos focuses on abandoned mine lands and water quality. Funding was awarded to the American Cave and Conservation Association to assist in developing NPS-related exhibits at its American Museum of Caves and Karstlands located in Horse Cave. The DOW has contracted with the Kentucky Waterways Alliance to award small grants to local citizen waterway groups for nonpoint source education projects. The DOW also continues to provide financial support for the Kentucky Master Logger Program.